1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 OAKLAND DIVISION 4 No. 4:10-cv-3873-CW (filed Aug. 30, 2010) Centrify Corporation, 5 Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant, 6 VS. 7 Quest Software, Inc., 8 Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff. 9 No. 4:11-cv-4675-CW (filed Sept. 20, 2011) 10 Centrify Corporation, (related case) 11 Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant, 12 VS. 13 Quest Software, Inc., 14 Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff. 15 16 STIPULATED ORDER STAYING LITIGATION 17 To promote efficiency for the Parties and Court, Quest Software, Inc. and Centrify 18 19 Corporation hereby agree and stipulate that Civil Action No. 4:10-cv-3873-CW and Civil Action 20 No. 4:11-cv-4675-CW shall be stayed effective immediately; and 21 The stay in each case will remain in effect during the period that begins upon the entry of 22 this Stipulation by the Court and ends ninety (90) days after the earlier of: 1. The Conclusion of Reexamination-Related Appeals in Both Reexaminations: Decision 23 24

- 1. The Conclusion of Reexamination-Related Appeals in Both Reexaminations: Decision of all reexamination-related appeals by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Application No. 95/001,458 (concerning U.S. Patent No. 7,617,501) and Application No. 95/001,434 (concerning U.S. Patent No. 7,591,005); or
- 2. The Conclusion of Reexamination-Related Appeal in Either Reexamination: If appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences are taken in one, but not both

25

26

27

28

Case4:11-cv-04675-CW Document30 Filed12/22/11 Page2 of 3 1 of Application No. 95/001,458 and Application No. 95/001,434, decision of all 2 reexamination-related appeals by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the 3 appealed case; or 4 3. The Deadline to File an Appeal When None Filed in Either Case: The deadline for the 5 Parties to file appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences passing in both 6 Application No. 95/001,458 and Application No. 95/001,434 without an appeal being 7 timely filed in either case. 8 9 Dated: December 22, 2011 10 11 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP **COOLEY LLP** 12 13 /s/ Ryan Sandrock /s/ Orion Armon 14 Ryan Sandrock Orion Armon Attorneys for Centrify Corp. Attorneys for Quest Software, Inc. 15 16 17 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION IT IS SO ORDERED: 18 19 Dated:____ 20 21 The Honorable Claudia Wilken United States District Judge 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

Case4:11-cv-04675-CW Document30 Filed12/22/11 Page3 of 3

1	ATTESTATION CLAUSE
2	I, Orion Armon, hereby attest in accordance with General Order No. 45.X(B) that Ryan Sandrock,
3	counsel for Plaintiff Centrify Corp., has provided his concurrence with the electronic filing of the
4	foregoing document entitled STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO MODIFY CASE
5	DEADLINES REGARDING EXPERT REPORTS.
6	Dated: December 22, 2011
7 8	/s/Orion Armon
	Orion Armon
9	367772 v1/CO
10	
11	
12	
13	
1415	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
ΑW	

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO